

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO 12/08/1999 YUNG-CHING SHA SHA-2 6937 09/456,806 EXAMINER 7590 08/26/2004 HENRY T BRENDZEL BLOUNT, STEVEN BOX 574 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER SPRINGFIELD, NJ 07081 2661

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT		ATTORNEY BOOK	
				ATTORNEY DOCK	ETT NO.
		•	EXAMINER		
			<u> </u>	and world that I	
			ART UNI	T DADED AN	
	•			T PAPER NI	OWREH
			DATE MAILED:	17	
•		EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY REC			
participants (applican	it, applicant's representa				
		·			
- NIC DE	en uzel	(3)			
Mr. B	<i>U</i>	. (4)			
te of intensions	123/04 and	8/24/04			
	• •		•		
		en to applicant applicant's representative).			
lioit snown or demons	stration conducted: U Y	es No. If yes, brief description:			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
eement 🗆 was reac	hed with respect to som	e or all of the claims in question. Wwas not reached			
	_				
	I and 2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u>-</u>		
ntification of prior art d	iscussed: 6075	767 (Sakamoto et al), 5,	870.382	(Tankist	-07
			01-1200	(100Mai ex	<u>v/</u>
······································					
cription of the general	nature of what was agre	eed to if an agreement was reached, or any other com	ments. See	a Harly went	
		,		The second	
				,	
•					
ller description, if nece hed. Also, where no	essary, and a copy of the	e amendments, if available, which the examiner agree	d would render the	claims allowable must	be
	sopy of the amendments	s which would render the claims allowable is available a separate record of the substance of the interview.	, a summary thereo	f must be attached.)	
ss the paragraph below	w has been checked to	indicate to the centron. A FORMAL MOTTER DECO	0110 = = -		
		indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPO E OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse an one month from this interview date to provide a stat			NOT at Office
-	,	and month noth this interview date to provide a stat	ement of the substa	ance of the interview.	
		above (including any attachments) reflects a complete ast Office action, and since the claims are now allowable of the complete action.			
box 1 above is als		ction. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separ	ate record of the su	ibstance of the interview	w unles
440 (05):		Lto.	yw.	8/24/04	
-413 (REV. 2 -93)		Fyaminara Ciana			

In the interview on 8/24/04, with respect to claim 1, Mr. Brendzel pointed out that Sakamoto et al does not teach user specified directives that flow to module 3, or signals flowing from decision logic to the two logic modules (esp. line 13 of claim 1). With respect to claim 23, Mr. Brendzel pointed out Sakamoto et al does not teach user specified directives as before, or comparing bits using a second register, and that there would be no motivation to combine Sakamoto and Tounai. Mr. Blount consulted with a Primary examiner, and on 8/24/04, told Mr. Brendzel that they felt that a reply to the Office action should be made, because they felt that there was an issue concerning the control signal 4, and that with respect to the previously discussed framers (and consequently the portion of claim 1 which states "develops signals that flow to said framer..."), the examiner referred to section C of the Office action. Mr. Brendzel again mentioned the issue concerning motivation to combine with respect to claim 23, and the examiner referred to column 8 lines 23+ of Sakamoto, and col 4 lines 35+ of Tounai.